

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Applicant has amended claim 23, and claims 23-27 remain pending in this application. In light of the amendments made above and the arguments to appear below, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Applicant has amended claim 23 to clarify its invention and respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. In particular, Applicant has amended claim 23 to include the limitation that the ball holder is releasably attached to the second rack portion. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, and therefore, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 23-27 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills (U.S. Patent No. 4,852,896). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office asserts in part that Mills discloses a rack comprising a first rack for releasably retaining golf clubs and a second rack portion having a golf ball holder attached thereto. Even if it were proper to modify Mills for use with billiard balls/cues (which it is not), not all of the limitations would be met. Applicant has amended independent claim 23 to recite the limitation that the inventive ball holder is “releasably attached” to the second rack portion of the rack (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach or suggest the “releasably attached” recitation. Rather, the cited reference teaches, at most, a ball holder comprised of a sleeve that is secured to the golf equipment carrier using L-shaped brackets and screws through the sleeve (see col. 5, lines 38-46). While the bracket and screw arrangement of Mills arguably makes the ball holder “removable,” it does not make it “releasable.” Therefore, the ball holder in Mills is fixedly attached to the carrier, not “releasably attached,” as now positively recited. Accordingly, because the cited reference does not teach or suggest each and every limitation, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 23 has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 24-27, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims either directly or indirectly depend from respective base claim 23 (believed allowable), and therefore, include each and every limitation thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above regarding the allowability of claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 24-27 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions, he/she is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 16, 2004

By: 

Jeffrey L. Doyle
Reg. No.: 54,074
Dykema Gossett PLLC
39577 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5086
(248) 203-0782
jdoyle@dykema.com